

The Review.

FOUNDED, EDITED, AND PUBLISHED BY ARTHUR PREUSS.

VOL. XI.

ST. LOUIS, Mo., APRIL 28, 1904.

No. 17.

FREEMASONRY IN WASHINGTON.

THE following telegram from Washington appeared in the New York *Sun* of April 16th :

"President Roosevelt has accepted an election to honorary membership in Pentalpha Lodge of Masons in the District of Columbia, and has been invited to participate in the celebration of the thirty-fifth anniversary of the lodge on May 4th next. He is already an honorary member of Federal Lodge, No. 1, of Washington, having been elected to that branch of the Masonic order shortly after his accession to the presidency. Federal Lodge is the oldest Masonic organization in the District of Columbia, and participated in the ceremonies attending the laying of the cornerstone of the Capitol. Mr. Roosevelt did not join the Masonic order until he was 42 years of age, he having been initiated into Matinecock Lodge, No. 806, at Oyster Bay, shortly after his election to the vice-presidency. He took the first, second, and third degree in the Oyster Bay lodge, respectively, on Jan. 2nd, March 27th, and April 24th, 1901. Pentalpha Lodge, of which President Roosevelt has now become an honorary member, was founded in May, 1869. James A. Garfield, then a member of Congress from Ohio, was one of the charter members."

Those who have had opportunity to observe the real character and affiliations of our public men, especially of such as have become prominent in national politics, are aware how small a proportion have escaped the attentions of the Craft, who have invariably tried to draw them into membership. In the national capital the Masonic Order has always been alert, not only to impress its character upon men whose high office might bring prestige to the lodge, but also to give a certain Masonic significance to public events and institutions. We may cite as instances the

Washington monument, which is visited by all sight-seers; many of its huge stones are inscribed as the gift and memorial of one or other grand lodge of the different States, while the statue of Albert Pike, the father of American Freemasonry, with the various symbols of the brotherhood ranged about the figure, stands facing the East, as becomes a disciple of the Grand Orient, in one of the most prominent of the open spaces of the city.

For nine years the magnificent statue of Father Marquette, the official gift of the State of Michigan to the national government, has remained in Statuary Hall unaccepted, and its acceptance was prevented by the bigots until the present session of Congress, when the fight was won and a resolution passed by which the gift was formally received. Not a murmur was heard against the erection of the statue of Pike, "Sovereign Pontiff," as he styled himself, of Luciferian Masonry; but Father Marquette, whom history has honored for the part he took in the exploration of our country and the civilization of its inhabitants, and whom the State of Michigan selected as its most illustrious representative, was a Jesuit priest. Who could say but that the placing of his statue, more than 200 years after his death, in the halls of Congress, would be the entering wedge in a fresh attempt by the Pope and the Jesuits to overthrow the liberties of this Republic? This sentiment, the outgrowth of ignorance and religious prejudice, seems to have outweighed all other considerations. The people of Michigan have been treated discourteously, not to say offensively, in having had their gift, a work of the highest art, excluded for so long a time from its proper place, while the statues presented by other States were unhesitatingly accepted; and the Catholics of every State have been made to realize that religious prejudice against them still survives at the very seat of government. Doubtless not a few of the congressmen whose opposition, exerted secretly, prevented the acceptance of the Marquette statue, were elected by the help of Catholic votes. Equally certain is it that they will be re-elected without a protest from those same Catholic voters who, rock-ribbed when it is question of fealty to their political party, have less moral backbone when their Church and its heroes, and their rights as Catholics are concerned, than the spineless jelly-fish.



REAL AND APPARENT DEATH IN RELATION TO THE HOLY SACRAMENTS.

4. Outside of putrefaction and, perhaps, of the stiffness characteristic of corpses, there is no certain mark of death.

As we have seen, life continues for some time beyond the moment that is commonly called death; during that period of apparent death the sacraments may be administered and, perhaps, the soul be saved. Therefore, it is of the utmost importance to know at least approximately how long that period lasts. Such approximate knowledge might be gathered either from a certain indication of death or some sign indicating the persistency of life.

As to the first alternative, one might ask: Is there any sign indicating certain death?

If we except putrefaction and, perhaps, rigidity, we can say, there is none. The Paris Academy of Medicine some years ago offered a prize for the best solution of that question, but it did not award the same to any of the 102 essays sent in. All seemed to describe certain signs indicating that the great functions of respiration and blood circulation had ceased, but life may persist in spite of such cessation. Nay, there are authorities who say that not even the cessation of respiration and circulation can be surely ascertained. [Cfr. *Razón y Fe*, No. xxxi, pp. 376 sq.] Not even bleeding is of absolute reliability, since in some diseases the veins will not let out a drop of blood under pressure. Neither are bluish shots on the body a certain sign of death. [See Capellmann, *Med. Past.*, p. 183, ed. 2. lat.] Cadaveric rigidity is considered a certain sign; laymen, however, are apt to confound it with the stiffness often preceding death in choleric patients or those suffering from asphyxiation, tetanus, etc.

Father Villada [*Casus*, vol. 3, p. 235,] states the whole argument briefly thus: "Constat etiam signa certae mortis non haberi pro omni casu nisi rigorem cadavericum et putredinem non praecise incipientem, sed aliquantum progressum, quibus addi potest defectus contractilitatis, seu musculorum reactionis sub influxu galvanico. Caetera signa quae afferri solent: palloris membrorum, speciei vultus cadaverici, circulationis sanguinis ac respirationis defectus, caloris dicti vitalis cessationis, imo macularum cadavericarum et ipsius oculi cadaverini seu flacci, fracti ac obscurati, non praebent nisi probabilia signa mortis aut saltem probabilissima, non vero absolute certa; imo cum admodum difficile sit distinguere rigorem cadavericum, qui observatur ex Capellmann, 1—24 horis post mortem et durat per 6—48 horas, et rigorem spasmaticum, asphyxicum, tetanicum, convulsivum, qui in quibusdam morbis ante mortem accidit; in praxi non remane-

bit certum aliud signum mortis pro omni casu, nisi putrefactio antea dicta, quaeque post tres dies tantum accidere solet."

Hence the assertion of Brouardel is correct that we have no single sign nor any combination of signs whereby we could with certainty ascertain the exact moment of real death.

Neither is there, before the appearance of putrefaction, any single sign nor any combination of signs that indicates the cadaveric state with *absolute certainty*.

The greenish coloring of the abdomen, which is usually the sign of incipient putrefaction, appears more or less quickly, according to the conditions of the outside temperature in which the body is kept; in a newly-born infant it will depend on the fact whether the child has breathed or not. Usually at the end of 24 or 36 hours evident signs of putrefaction will appear, especially in summer.

As said previously, diverse methods have been invented to make those apparently dead give signs of life, or, if possible to restore them to health; chief among these is Laborde's "rythmical traction of the tongue," of which we shall treat in another paper.

28 24 28

IS THE SINGLE TAX THEORY AN OPEN QUESTION?

III.

LEO XIII. AND INDIVIDUAL LAND OWNERSHIP.

"For the rest, in whatever manner the earth may be divided among private owners, it never ceases to minister to the needs of all; for there is no one who does not derive his subsistence from the produce of the soil. Those who have no (landed) property, make up for this by their labor. Hence it may truly be said that all human subsistence is derived either from the labor expended on one's own land (*in labore consistere, quem quis vel in fundo insumat suo*) or from the toil of some other calling whose reward consists in some product of the soil, or at any rate is exchanged for what the land brings forth."

"Hence there arises a new proof that private property is in perfect harmony with the natural law. For the things which man needs for the preservation of his life, and especially for his well-being, the earth furnishes indeed in great abundance, but she can not do so without cultivation and care expended on the soil. Now if a man exerts both his mental faculties and his physical strength in procuring the fruits of nature, by so doing he makes his own that portion of the earth which he cultivates and on which he leaves as it were the impress of his personality. Wherefore it can

not but be just that he should possess that same portion of the earth as his very own, and it can not be lawful for any one to violate such right."

"Qua ex re rursus efficitur, privatas possessiones plane esse secundum naturam. Res enim eas, quae ad conservandam vitam maximeque ad perficiendam requiruntur, terra quidem cum magna largitate fundit, sed fundere ex se sine hominum cultu et curatione non posset. Jamvero cum in parandis naturae bonis industria mentis viresque corporis homo insumat, hoc ipso applicat ad se eam naturae corporeae partem, quam ipse percoluit, in qua velut formam quandam personae suae impressam reliquit; ut omnino rectum esse oporteat, eam partem possideri ab eo uti suam, nec ullo modo jus ipsius violare cuiquam licere."

"The force of these arguments is so evident that it seems amazing that some should again be setting up certain obsolete opinions in opposition to what has here been maintained. They grant to the individual man the use of the soil and the various products of landed possessions, but declare it absolutely wrong that one should consider himself the real owner of the land on which he has built or of the estate which he has brought under cultivation. Forsooth, the opponents of land ownership do not see that they are robbing man of the very fruits of his labor. For the soil which is cultivated with toil and skill utterly changes its condition: from being wild it becomes productive, from being barren fruitful. That which has thus altered and improved the land is so closely connected and so perfectly identified with the same, that for the greatest part it can in no wise be separated any more from it. Now should it not be a violation of justice that any one appropriate for himself and enjoy that which another has gained in the sweat of his brow? As effects follow the cause by which they have been produced, so it is but just and right that the result of labor belong to those who have bestowed their labor."

"Horum tam perspicua vis est argumentorum, ut mirabile videatur, dissentire quosdam exoletarum opinionum restitutores: qui usum quidem soli, variosque praediorum fructus homini privato concedunt: at possideri ab eo ut domino vel solum, in quo aedificavit, vel praedium, quod excoluit, plane jus esse negant. Quod cum negant, fraudatum iri partis suo labore rebus hominem, non vident. Ager quippe cultoris manu atque arte subactus habitum longe mutat: e silvestri frugifer, ex infecundo ferax efficitur. Quibus autem rebus est melior factus, illae sic solo inhaerent miscenturque penitus, ut maximam partem nullo pacto sint separabiles a solo. Atqui id quemquam potiri illoque perfui, in quo alias desudavit, utrumne justitia patiatur? Quo modo effectae

res caussam sequuntur a qua effectae sunt, sic operae fructum ad eos ipsos qui operam dederint, rectum est pertinere."

"With good reason, therefore, has the whole of mankind, not minding the dissenting opinions of a few, but rather carefully studying the demands of nature, found in the natural law itself the foundation for the division of earthly goods, and has by the practice of all ages consecrated the existence of private possessions as being pre-eminently in harmony with human nature and conducive to the peace and tranquillity of society."

"The civil laws, moreover, which, so long as they are just, derive their binding force from the natural law, likewise confirm and protect, even by coercion, the right of property we are speaking of."

"The same has, finally, been sanctioned by the authority of the divine law, which most severely forbids even coveting that which belongs to another. 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his house, nor his field, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is his' (Deut. 5, 21.)"

Thus far we have considered man merely as an individual person. Now if we take into account his family relation, his right of having private property will appear in still clearer light. "The right of private property, which has been proved to belong naturally to man as an individual, must likewise belong to him in his capacity as head of a family; nay, his right must be the stronger as in the domestic circle his charge extends over more persons."

"Quod igitur demonstravimus, jus dominii personis singularibus naturâ tributum, id transferri in hominem, qua caput est familiæ, oportet: immo tanto jus est illud validius, quanto persona humana in convictu humano plura complectitur."

The welfare and security of the family for the present and the future, require "the ownership of lucrative property, which by inheritance can be transmitted to the children." It is, therefore, a demand of nature that such right be vested in the head of the family independently of the State, since the family is naturally prior to the State, and that such right should be protected rather than destroyed or curtailed in the commonwealth. "The scheme of Socialists, therefore, which, setting aside the parental solicitude, introduces in its place State supervision, is contrary to natural justice and menaces the stability of all family life."

Finally the peace and security of society at large also demand most emphatically the existence of private property; without it the way would be paved to a slavish dependence of the citizens

on the State and a wide door be thrown open to mutual discord, to universal misery and degradation.

"From all we have said it is clear that the main tenet of Socialists, viz., the substitution of common for private ownership, must be utterly rejected. It does harm to those who are to be assisted; it is contrary to the natural rights of individuals; it perverts the functions of the State; it destroys the peace and harmony of society. The first and most fundamental principle, accordingly, if we want to alleviate the miserable condition of the masses, must be the inviolability of private property."

"Ex quibus omnibus perspicitur, illud Socialismi placitum de possessionibus in commune redigendis omnino repudiari oportere, quia iis ipsis, quibus est opitulandum, nocet; naturalibus singulorum juribus repugnat, officia reipublicae tranquillitatemque communem perturbat. Maneat ergo, cum plebi sublevatio quaeritur, hoc in primis haberi fundamenti instar oportere, privatas possessiones inviolate servandas."

Such is the teaching of Leo XIII. on individual land ownership.
(*To be continued.*)



THE CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION OF MASONIC SYMBOLS.

Mr. Mackey says in his Masonic Encyclopaedia [pp. 162, 163] on the "Christianization of Freemasonry:"

"The interpretation of the symbols of Freemasonry from a Christian point of view is a theory adopted by some of the most distinguished Masonic writers of England and this country, but one which, I think, does not belong to the ancient system. Hutchinson, and after him Oliver—profoundly philosophical as are the speculations of both—have, I am constrained to believe, fallen into a great error in calling the Master Mason's degree a Christian institution. It is true that it embraces within its scheme the great truths of Christianity upon the subject of the immortality of the soul and the resurrection of the body; but this was to be presumed because Freemasonry is truth and all truth must be identical. But the origin of each is different; their histories are dissimilar. The principles of Freemasonry preceded the advent of Christianity. Its symbols and its legends are derived from the people even anterior to that. Its religion comes from the ancient priesthood; its faith was the primitive one of Noah and his immediate descendants. If Masonry were simply a Christian institution, the Jew and the Moslem, the Brahman and the Buddhist, could not conscientiously partake of its illumination. But its universality is its boast. In its language, citizens of every nation can

converse; at its altar, men of all religions may kneel; to its creed, disciples of every faith may subscribe.

"Yet it can not be denied that since the advent of Christianity, a Christian element has been almost imperceptibly infused into the Masonic system, at least among Christian Masons. This has been a necessity, for it is the tendency of every predominant religion to pervade with its influence all that surrounds it or is about it, whether religious, political or social.....and hence we find Christian Masonic writers indulging in it (the Christian interpretation of Masonic symbols) to an almost unwarrantable excess, and by the extent of their sectarian interpretations, materially affecting the cosmopolitan character of the institution."

According to this eminent authority, therefore, a Christian interpretation of Masonic symbols is a comparatively modern innovation, and "does not belong to the ancient system." A Christian origin for the master's degree is a "great error." Christianity and Masonry, even if in some doctrine they agree, have the doctrine from different sources and by dissimilar descent: "their origin and histories are different." Masonry precedes Christianity, is descended from the ancient priesthood, comes from the pure religion of Noah and the patriarchs.

But whence comes Christianity? Our author does not tell us. He tells us indeed that it does not come from the pure religion of Noah and the patriarchs, for he denies a common origin to Masonry and Christianity. Christianity is, moreover, too sectarian for Masonry. If Masonry were Christianity, "the Jew and the Moslem, the Brahman and the Buddhist, could not conscientiously partake of its illumination." Now as the enlightenment of Masonry is held to regard the true nature of God and of the human soul, Christianity, by the clearest of implications here, as by the clearest of statements elsewhere, is ignorant of both; otherwise the Jew and the Moslem, the Brahman and the Buddhist, could in all conscience partake of its enlightenment. Masonic Christian writers have, therefore, gone to almost unwarrantable excess in Christian interpretation, and have made that religion sectarian whose boast is the possession of such a universality, "that at its altar, men of all religions may kneel; and to its creed, disciples of every faith may subscribe."

Christianity, therefore, in the eyes of Masonry, is not divine. Christ is not God; for otherwise it could not put Christianity on a level with all the other religions of mankind—Mohammedanism and Judaism and Brahmanism and Buddhism and Greek and Roman and Syrian and Egyptian paganism. And this is not anti-Christianity! Verily, Masonry must have a strange idea of the Christianity that will accept such a position.

But Masonry does not even put Christianity on a par with paganism. It exalts the latter far above the former. We have seen how it sends its disciples in their search for divine truth, not to Christianity, but to the pagan mysteries; we have seen how it derives the pagan mysteries, as it derives its own origin, from the same pure religion of Noah, from which, however, it excludes Christianity. Let us hear in what terms, by the lips of our author, it speaks of Brahmanism, that, comparing the sentiments expressed here with those set forth in the "Christianization of Masonry," we may the better realize what Masonic tendencies are.

My quotation is taken from page 125 of the Encyclopaedia of Freemasonry:

"Brahmanism," he says, "is the religious system practiced by the Hindoos. It presents a profound and spiritual philosophy, strangely blended with the basest superstitions. The Vedas are the Brahmanical Book of the Law, although the older hymns springing out of the primitive Aryan religion have a date far anterior to that of comparatively modern Brahmanism. The 'Laws of Menu' are really the text-book of Brahmanism; yet in the Vedic hymns we find the expression of that religious thought that has been adopted by the Brahmans and the rest of the Hindoos. The learned Brahmans have an esoteric faith in which they recognize and adore one God without form or quality, eternal, unchangeable and occupying all space; but confining this hidden doctrine to their interior schools, they teach for the multitude an open or esoteric" (our author doubtless meant: exoteric) "worship in which the incomprehensible attributes of the supreme and purely spiritual God are invested with sensible and even human forms. In the Vedic hymns all the powers of nature are personified, and become the objects of worship, thus leading to an apparent polytheism. But as Mr. J. F. Clarke (*Ten Great Religions*, p. 90) remarks, 'behind this incipient polytheism lurks the original monotheism; for each of these gods, in turn becomes the Supreme Being.' And Max Müller says, (*Chips I, 2*) that it would be easy to find in the numerous hymns of the Veda, passages in which almost every important deity is represented as supreme and absolute. This most ancient religion—believed in by one-seventh of the world's population, that fountain from which has flowed so much of the stream of modern religious thought, abounding in mystical ceremonies and ritual prescriptions, worshiping as the Lord of all 'the source of golden light,' having its ineffable name, its solemn rites—is well worth the serious study of the Masonic scholar, because in it he will find much that will be suggestive to him in the investigations of the dogmas of his order."

Compare the two passages, kind reader, and realize how Chris-

tian the spirit of Masonry is. Study Brahmanism, this "profound and spiritual philosophy strangely blended with the basest superstitions"; study the religion of those who, "investing the incomprehensible attributes of the supreme and purely spiritual God with sensible and human forms," lead the multitudes not merely to an apparent, but to a real polytheism; trust yourselves to guides who have one doctrine for themselves, the few, and knowingly and deliberately teach falsehood to the many:—all this "is well worth the serious study of the Masonic scholar, because in it he will find much that will be suggestive to him in the investigations of the dogmas of his order." He will not find here authors that "go to almost unwarrantable lengths in a sectarian interpretation," but on the contrary a "fountain of religious thought" and "mystical ceremonies" and "ritual prescriptions," and the "worship of the 'source of golden light' as the Lord of all," and an "ineffable name" and "solemn methods of initiation" and "symbolic rites."

Far better, then, for the Mason to be a Brahman, than to be a Christian. The doctrines of the former, especially the esoteric ones, are, according to Masonry, drawn from the same pure sources of primitive Aryan monotheism as its own; those of the latter are not: the esoteric Brahman worships the God of Masonry, "the source of golden light, the Lord of all"; the Christian does not; Brahmanism does not clash with the universality of Masonry; Christianity does. Place the two before the Mason for his choice, and which should be logically embrace? The answer is emphatic, Brahmanism.



BOOK REVIEWS AND LITERARY NOTES.

Harry Russell, a Rockland College Boy (pp. 229); *Saint Cuthbert's* (pp. 245): both by Rev. J. E. Copus, S. J. [Cuthbert]. Benziger Brothers.

These are two very commendable contributions to Catholic juvenile literature, brimful of interesting and instructive incidents, that can not fail to win the hearts of American college boys. We admire the skill of the author in introducing most useful moral lessons without in any way incurring the odium of "preaching." The relation of Harry Russell's complications with his teacher, or the episode of Cullane and his father, may serve as instances in point. Neither of the two tales can, it is true, make pretensions to the higher graces of fiction. They have no real plot, but present only a series of rather loosely connected episodes

in a college boy's career. Besides, in a number of cases probability is put to quite a severe strain. Many of the circumstances connected with the inheritance of Harry Russell, as well as the class outing, and "A walk and what came of it" in "St. Cuthbert's," are of such a nature. Both stories, moreover, have a rather unsatisfactory close.

These blemishes, however, are amply compensated by the merits already pointed out. And, all in all, Father Copus may be justly congratulated upon having unfolded to us some novel and interesting phases in the life of the American college boy.



—Arrangements are being made for a thorough revision of Liddell and Scott's Greek-English Lexicon, quarto edition. Mr. Arthur Sidgwick will undertake the active duties of editorship as soon as he is free from certain other literary engagements, and the collection of materials has already begun. This announcement will be welcome to all who are interested in the state of Greek studies in this country. For the greater part of our English speaking students are largely dependent on the knowledge imparted in this famous dictionary. And it is satisfactory to know that it is to be kept abreast with the progress of Greek scholarship.

—The Rev. editor of the *Messenger*, who some time ago objected to certain statements in Appleton's Universal Cyclopædia and Atlas, and in the New International Encyclopædia, now announces (XLI, 4) that both Appleton & Co., and Dodd, Mead & Co., began revision immediately, and that these cyclopædias are now as far as possible what they are said to be in the prospectuses and circulars issued to describe them, and whatever criticisms may be made concerning their general merits or defects, there is so little comparatively that is defective that no one can reasonably complain. He, therefore, commends these cyclopædias to Catholic readers "for what encyclopædias ought to be, excellent ready reference books, and, if not a collection of exhaustive treatises on every subject, at least reliable guides to sources of complete information."

—In his latest book: 'Man's Place in the Universe,' Sir Alfred R. Wallace claims that these conclusions have been reached and proved by modern astronomers: 1. That the stellar universe forms one connected whole; and, though of enormous extent, is yet finite, and its extent determinable. 2. That the solar system is situated in the plane of the Milky Way, and not far removed from the centre of that plane. The earth is therefore nearly in the centre of the stellar universe. 3. That the universe consists throughout of the same kind of matter, and is subjected to the

same physical and chemical laws. The conclusions which Professor Wallace claims to have enormous probabilities in their favor are : 4. That no other planet in the solar system than our earth is inhabited or habitable. 5. That the probabilities are almost as great against any other sun possessing inhabited planets. 6. That the nearly central position of our sun is probably a permanent one, and has been specially favorable, perhaps absolutely essential, to life-development on the earth.

—Speaking of the ‘Cambridge Modern History, Planned by the Late Lord Acton,’ of which the second volume has lately appeared, a critic in the *Independent* [No. 2889] writes :

“It is an experiment on a large scale in the field of co-operative history writing. It rests upon the assumption that the problem of satisfactorily treating such a subject as the Protestant Reformation in one large volume by one author is insoluble, and that, therefore, there is nothing for it but a division of labor. This assumption, however, is not yet proven, and will not be until individual writers of equal ability with the best of these contributors have tried their hands at the task. The real question is whether readers are going permanently to prefer a volume vouched for mainly by the reputation of editors and publishers, to one that carries weight by the historical and literary character of one important author. The appeal here is the journalistic one; the enterprise is one of editing rather than of writing, and judgment must be passed upon a multitude of ‘contributions’ rather than upon a work of consistent literary and scholarly skill. We can not believe that, as between these two ideals of historical writing, the reading world will be long in doubt. Probably these volumes will fill a certain interim demand, but with the revival of good historical composition that is sure to follow the present activity in collection and interpretation, the importance of the individual historian is going to reassert itself. Then we may look with confidence for a return to the interest in history that once gathered about the names of men who could really write it so as to command the attention of the best minds among their fellows.”

It is remarkable, by the way, that the conclusions of the four non-Catholic scholars who in this second volume of the Cambridge History between them tell the story of the Protestant Reformation, are substantially those of Dr. Lingard. Minor differences there are no doubt, and our knowledge of detail has in many directions been added to; but it is the Reformation of Dr. Lingard, and not the Reformation of Burnet, or Hume, or Froude, or Wakeman, which we recognize in this volume, written by four Protestant scholars.

MINOR TOPICS.

Episcopal Indulgences.—On the occasion of the pontifical jubilee of Leo XIII. several bishops asked him for the favor to extend, as a perpetual memorial of his jubilee, the faculty of bishops to grant indulgences. Leo XIII. referred the petition to the S. Congregation of Indulgences, but died before he could act upon it. His successor Pius X., in an audience of Aug. 28th, 1903, willingly acceded to the request and granted faculties to bestow an indulgence of 200 days to all cardinals, both in their titular churches and their dioceses; of 100 days to all archbishops, and of 50 days to all bishops.

Since the IV. Council of the Lateran (A. D., 1215), bishops had the faculty of granting an indulgence of 40 days, except when consecrating a church, when they could grant an indulgence of one year. Archbishops could grant no more, (cfr. Beringer, *Les indulgences*, p. 40); cardinals could grant 100 days in their titular church or diocese, if they had any. In Spain and Latin America the archbishops had faculties to grant an indulgence of 80 days, and Leo XIII. confirmed them the privilege under date of July 4th, 1899. (See Appendix to the decrees of the Plenary Council of Latin America, No. CXX.)

The above faculties can be exercised "in forma consueta ecclesiae," which, according to Father Ferreres (*Rozón y Fe*, VIII, p. 386) means that :

1. Said indulgences are applicable to the living, but not to the dead;
2. Archbishops and cardinals can grant them not only in their own dioceses, but also in those of their suffragans;
3. Bishops can apply them only to their own dioceses, but their subjects can gain them even outside of their home diocese. Local indulgences granted by the bishop may be gained also by strangers, if they comply with the conditions;
4. No prelate can apply an indulgence to any act or article of devotion that has been previously indulged by the pope or others authorized by him, unless by adding new conditions;
5. No bishop can indulge any act or object of piety already indulged by his predecessor, nor an archbishop one indulged by his suffragans;
6. Nor can a bishop divide a work into its parts and concede an indulgence to each part, e. g., to each of the petitions of the Our Father, 50 days;
7. Titular bishops, even if auxiliaries to resident bishops, can grant no indulgences;
8. Residential bishops duly nominated, although not consecrated, can grant indulgences;
9. Vicar-generals, without special permission from their ordinary, can grant no indulgence;
10. Capitular vicars (administrators of dioceses) probably have no such faculties either.

When Will the *Motu Proprio* on the Reform of Church Music go in Force? On this question, now frequently asked, we find the subjoined

timely reflections in the *Catholic Examiner*, published in far-off East India :

"Perhaps the laity do not know that the publication of an ecclesiastical document in the current press counts for nothing in the eyes of the Church—except in cases where the periodical is an official organ and mouthpiece of the Church. Hence the public may know all about a piece of ecclesiastical legislation long before it comes into actual working. Putting aside the ordinary newspapers as being unofficial, this is how in practice the law is brought into effect. First it is promulgated in Rome ; and, according to the prevailing view of canonists, this promulgation has the force of law for the whole world. In order, however, that the law may come into effect in different countries, a copy of the document is sooner or later officially communicated to the bishops. The bishops then examine the law ; and if they find in it anything which seems inapplicable to their own region, they can consider the matter and make representation of their circumstances to Rome.

When the whole affair has been properly considered, the bishops issue a pastoral or other instruction to the clergy or to the faithful, and then in due time see that the law is carried out. All this must take time ; and meanwhile the laity and the clergy can hold their souls in peace. Were the carrying out of the law left to individuals, considerable confusion might ensue. The present instance is a good one in point. The document requires careful reading, besides knowledge of the subject. We have seen people writing under the impression that it will abolish all modern music and leave us nothing but Gregorian ; whereas it says just the contrary. The first and highest place is given to Gregorian, and a high second place to the Palestrina style. Modern music comes third, but requires judicious selection. Yet the Pope expressly says that modern music comprises many compositions which can lay claim to 'excellence, sobriety, and due regard to liturgical laws.' Again, as to the rapidity with which the reform should be effected—it is evident that the utmost should be done. But the decree of the Congregation of Rites shows due consideration for the difficulties of inducing a sudden change, and without ordering an instantaneous revolution, which would throw all things into confusion, requires that the improvement should be carried out 'as soon as possible.' In practice, one of the first things will be to determine what music already in use possesses the qualities required and what does not. And for this purpose the ordinaries are directed to prepare lists. The next thing will be to obtain new music where necessary, and to learn it—all of which must again in the nature of the case take time, even after the official communication has been applied."

Editions of the Solesmes Chant.—Referring to the article of Rev. P. Dominic, O. S. B., on Plain Chant and Congregational Singing (REVIEW, xi, 13), it may interest your readers to know that the "Kyriale" (*Ordinarium Missae*) of Solesmes has already been published in three editions: (Desclée, Tournay, Belgium; or Gregoriusverlag, Seckau, Steiermark); one edition in modern notes ; another in plain chant notes ; a third one is the organ accompaniment by Rev. M. Horn, O. S. B. (price about \$1.20).

The "Liber Gradualis" of the Solesmes edition is the large edition

containing Introitus, Graduale, Offertorium, Communio. The smaller edition of the Liber Gradualis is called Liber Usualis (or Epitome); the organ accompaniment is written by the well-known G. Bas, a pupil of Rheinsberger. As to English hymn books for congregational singing, "Psallite" (167 Catholic English Hymns), is an excellent collection of hymns for congregational singing (published by Herder, St. Louis.) The fact that Rev. L. Bonvin, S. J., the famous musical composer, has written the organ accompaniment, is the best proof of the excellency of this collection.—(Rev.) A. Hemmersbach, Mt. St. Joseph's Seminary, Hamilton Co., Ohio.

Rev. P. Dominic himself informs us that the Solesmes (or as it is now generally called, the traditional) Kyriale may be purchased through Rev. Gregory Hügle, O. S. B., New Engelberg Abbey, Conception, Mo.

"The Kyriale," he adds, "is printed in two editions, in the ancient pneumatic notation, and in modern notation. It goes without saying that for our singers the modern notation is the one wanted. Be sure to mention in your order that you want modern notation. It will also be advisable to procure the organ accompaniment to the Kyriale, particularly if your organist is not accustomed to accompany plain chant."

Was Cardinal Newman of Jewish Descent?—Most of our readers are probably aware that the late Cardinal Newman was on both sides of his family of foreign extraction. His father's was Dutch, the name being originally Nieumann, while his mother's was French, she being a scion of the Fourdriniers, an old Huguenot house. Mr. Percy Fitzgerald, who knew him well, says [Fifty Years of Catholic Life and Progress, 1900, vol. ii, p. 252], that "Newman's features even were scarcely English, and in old age assumed the cast of an antique Dutchman."

Now we read in the life just issued by Rev. Dr. Barry ('Newman,' by William Barry. New York: Scribner's Sons. 1904. Pages 7-8):

"He (John Henry's) father was chief clerk and afterwards partner in a banking firm, was also a Freemason, with a high standing in the craft, an admirer of Franklin, and an enthusiastic reader of Shakespeare. These particulars, except the last, will prepare us for the fact that in an earlier generation the family had spelt its signature 'Newmann'; that it was understood to be of Dutch origin; and that its real descent was Hebrew. The talent for music, calculation, and business, the untiring energy, legal acumen, and dislike of speculative metaphysics, which were conspicuous in John Henry, bear out this interesting genealogy. A large part of his character and writings will become intelligible if we keep this in mind. That his features had a strong Jewish cast, is evident from his portraits, and was specially to be noted in old age. It may be conjectured that the migration of these Dutch Jews to England fell within a period not very distant from the death of Spinoza in 1675. But there is not the slightest trace in Newman of acquaintance with modern Hebrew literature or history; so far as we can tell he had never opened the 'Ethics,' and the only Mendelssohn he knew by name was probably the author of 'Elijah.'"

"Race Suicide."—That the Rooseveltian campaign against "race suicide" is indeed timely, appears from a paper in the *Independent* [No. 2889], in which Mrs. Lydia K. Commander gives the results of an investigation made recently in New York. Here are a few of her conclusions:

"That the size of the American family has diminished."

"That the decline is greatest among the rich and educated, but also exists, to a marked extent, among the middle class and the intelligent poor."

"That not only has the large family disappeared, but it is no longer desired."

"That the prevailing American ideal, among rich and poor, educated and un-educated, women and men, is two children."

"That childlessness is no longer considered a disgrace or even a misfortune, but is frequently desired and voluntarily sought."

"That opposition to large families is so strong an American tendency that our immigrants are speedily influenced by it; even Jews, famous for ages for their love of family, exhibiting its effects."

"That the large family is not only individually, but socially, disapproved; the parents of numerous children meeting public censure."

Is not this a terrible state of affairs? It is refreshing to note that the *Independent* editorially deprecates the obvious tendency of Mrs. Commander's paper, by boldly and frankly stating its conviction that "a large family in any but the lowest strata of society is a beautiful institution, conducive to the noblest and most unselfish character and crowned with blessings to the parents in their old age."

The Celebration of St. Patrick's Day.—We have this year again received the usual quota of newspaper clippings with discrediting reports on the celebration of St. Patrick's Day. We have expressed our opinion on these abuses so often that repetition is unnecessary. To show that the better class of our Irish brethren is in full accord with us, we quote some remarks of Msgr. P. F. O'Hara of Brooklyn delivered from his pulpit and printed later in No. 3687 of the N. Y. *Freeman's Journal*:

"We all know that the Irish societies get up a ball for St. Patrick's night. Well, now, I don't think that the proper and dignified way to honor St. Patrick during Lent. It would be more in keeping with our Catholic spirit and teaching to have some other form of entertainment, such as a lecture, the rendering of a program of Irish music, or something elevating and instructive like that, and leave your ball alone for some other time. St. Patrick was in himself the embodiment of penance, and it was by his great sufferings and acts of self-denial that so many graces were given the Irish race. We resent very properly any insults given our people on the stage, but does not our conduct very often, such as is manifested at balls on St. Patrick's night, give our enemies opportunities of saying things that bring the blush of shame to the cheeks of intelligent Irishmen?"

